(a) whether Government are aware of the great hardships being faced by the litigants in Delhi Courts on account of the reversion of certain Additional District Judges and their consequential proceeding on leave;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof and the manner in which those cases meant for the reverted Additional Session Judges were allocated to different Metropolitan Judges;

(c) what are the names of the Additionial Judges who were reverted and the details of charges against each Judge alongwith the years of service put in by each Judge as Additional Session Judge; and

(d) since when those charges were pending against them?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW , JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): (a) to (d) The Registry of the Delhi High Court has reported that four members of the Delhi Judicial service namely S/Shri P. K. Dham, M. S. Rohilla, Shiv Charan and D. S. Sidhu who were officiating in Delhi Higher Judicial Service in temporary capacity as Additional District & Sessions Judges were reverted consequent upon their non-selection for being placed on probation in the Delhi Higher Judicial Service, to the Substantive post *i.e.* Selection Grade of Delhi Judicial Service *w.e.f.* 16.2.95 and in the courts vacated by these officers on their reversion other officers have been posted or work of those courts has been allocated to the other courts.

One of the four reverted officers has sought voluntary retirement. Each of the magisterial courts including the three magisterial courts in which these officers have been posted after their reversion, have link Magistrates to look after the work of the concerned Magisterial Courts in case any Presiding Officer of Magisterial Court happens to be on leave so that litigants are not put to any hardship.

High Court Bench at Madurai

4801. SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what are the norms followed in establishing High Court Benches in different parts of States apart from the State capital; and

(b) what is the obstacle in establishing a Bench of Madras High Court in Madurai?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW , JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): (a) In its report, the Jaswant Singh Commission suggested the broad principles and criteria to be followed while deciding the question of expediency and desirability of establishment of a Bench of a High Court away from the principal seat and the factors to be kept in view in selecting the venue of the said Bench. The report of the Commisson was placed in the Parliament Library on 15.10.86 and was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha on 20.4.87 and 21.4.87 respectively, which may be referred to, The question of opening a High Court Bench is considered by the Central Government in the light of these principles and criteria as and when a proposal is received from the State Government in consultation with the Chief Justice of the concerned High Court.

(b) A complete proposal for establishing a Bench of Madras High Court at Madurai has not been received from the Government of Tamil Nadu, in consultation with the Chief Justice of the High Court, in the light of recommendations of the Jaswant Singh Commission.

Revision of Electoral roll in Kashmir

4802. SHRI BHAGABAN MAJHI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state: